

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject application are respectfully solicited.

Claims 11, 12, and 16 through 22 are pending, with Claims 11, 17, and 20 being independent. Claims 11, 12, and 16 through 19 have been amended. Claims 20 through 22 have been added. The specification has been amended.

The specification was objected to for failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. In particular, the Official Action states that the features of (a) a front and rear optical system wherein the front optical system includes a shake correction optical system, (b) the number of lens elements as claimed, and (c) the composite lens, are all depicted but not described in the specification. This objection is respectfully traversed, and is submitted to have been obviated by the amendment of the specification in a manner earnestly believed to obviate the grounds of objection. In particular, Applicant respectfully submits that the amendments to page 3, line 16 and page 4, line 12 obviate (b) and (c), and the amendment to page 4, line 15 obviates (a). In connection with said amendment, Applicant respectfully notes that information contained in the drawings may be added to the specification without introducing new matter. MPEP 2163.06. Favorable consideration is earnestly solicited.

Claims 11, 12, and 16 through 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over U.S. Patent No. 4,013,339 (Ando, et al.) in view of U.S. Patent Nos. 3,942,862 (Furukawa, et al.) and 5,107,293 (Sekine, et al.). All rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claims 11 and 17 recite, inter alia, an erecting optical system, in combination with (a) a sensor for detecting a shake of the apparatus, and (b) a correction optical system for suppressing a shake of an image of the object, the image being created by the front optical system, the erecting optical system, and the rear optical system, the suppression being in accordance with an output from the sensor.

Claim 20 recites, inter alia, a sensor for detecting a shake of the apparatus, wherein the closest one to the erecting optical system, among the plurality of optical elements of the front optical system, suppresses a shake of an image of the object, the image being created by the front optical system, the erecting optical system, and the rear optical system, the suppression being in accordance with an output from the sensor.

However, Applicant respectfully submits that there has been no showing of any indication of motivation in the cited documents that would lead one having ordinary skill in the art to arrive at the above-discussed combinations of claimed features as recited, inter alia, in Claims 11, 17, and 20. Applicant respectfully submits that Ando, et al. and Furukawa, et al. lack sensors as claimed. Applicant respectfully notes that Sekine, et al. states in its Abstract, e.g., “A camera using this device is arranged to correct the shaking of the camera on the basis of the result of a computing operation performed on a camera shake detected from the signal produced from the image sensor together with a camera shake physically detected by means of an accelerometer.” However, Applicant respectfully submits that there has been no showing of any indication of motivation in the cited documents that would lead one having ordinary skill in the art to select the image sensor, the accelerometer, or any detector from Sekine, et al. and attempt

to combine the same with Ando, et al. and Furukawa, et al. so as to arrive at the above-discussed claimed combinations of features. Also, with regard to Sekine, et al.'s image sensor, Applicant respectfully submits that assuming, arguendo, that such could be combined with Ando, et al., the image sensor would obscure the visual axis of an observer, which is impractical.

The dependent claims are also submitted to be patentable because they set forth additional aspects of the present invention and are dependent from independent claims discussed above. Therefore, separate and individual consideration of each dependent claim is respectfully requested.

Applicant submits that this application is in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address given below.

Respectfully submitted,



Attorney for Applicant
Daniel S. Glueck
Registration No. 37,838

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

DC_MAIN 173296v1